

**REMARKS**

**I. Formal Matters.**

Claims 1-7 are currently pending in this application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for returning initialled copies of Forms PTO/SB/08 A&B that were appended to Information Disclosure Statements submitted on January 7 and April 12, 2004, to signify her consideration of the references cited therein. Applicant also thanks the Official Draftsperson for approving the drawings filed with the application papers on January 30, 2002.

**II. 35 U.S.C. §103(a).**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Martin, Jr., et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105) ("*Martin*") in view of *Masahiro Fujii* (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,537) ("*Fujii*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 requires, “. . . a plurality of mobile stations capable of participating simultaneously in communication with said portable information terminal unit . . .”. The Examiner acknowledges that *Martin* fails to teach “a plurality of mobile stations, each of which communicates with said information terminal” (OA, i.e. at page 3). However, The Examiner asserts that, “. . . in a mobile station and terminal unit environment, multiple stations are connected to a terminal and are interchangeable” (OA, i.e. at page 3). The Examiner further asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based on the suggestion

in *Martin* that a mobile station communicates with a terminal unit, that a plurality of mobile stations connected to the portable information terminal unit is implied (OA page 3).

However, *Martin* teaches a plurality of mobile devices (106-1, 1-6-2) *connected to a base station* (102), the base station communicating simultaneously to the plurality of mobile devices (Martin col. 5 lines 24-28; col. 6 lines 42-44; Figs. 1A and 2A). The mobile devices taught by *Martin* include PDA devices (Martin col. 5 lines 19-24).

In contrast, claim 1 requires “. . . a plurality of *mobile stations* capable of participating simultaneously in communication with said portable information terminal unit . . .”. Applicant further describes a portable information terminal unit as a mobile device such as a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) (*Application* [0024]). The portable information terminal unit is capable of short distance high speed wireless communication simultaneously with a plurality of mobile stations ([0024]; claim 1). The mobile stations are connected to a mobile data network through a radio access network (RAN), wherein the RAN is composed of *a base station*. (*Application* [0026]; claim 1)<sup>1</sup>.

Neither in the text and figures cited by the Examiner, nor in the rest of the specification , does *Martin* teach or suggest a portable information terminal unit simultaneously communicating with mobile stations. Secondary reference *Fujii* also fails to teach or suggest this claim element. At least for failing to teach or suggest a portable information terminal unit simultaneously

---

<sup>1</sup> Numbers in brackets refer to paragraph numbers provided in the Published Application, No. US 2002/0107694 A1, August 8, 2002.

communicating with mobile stations the alleged obviousness of claim 1 over *Martin* in view of *Fujii* under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn

Independent device and system claims 2-6 and methods claim 7 include limitations analogous to the ones described above distinguishing claim 1 from primary reference *Martin* and secondary reference *Fuji*. Therefore, they should be allowed at least for analogous reasons.

Further, with respect to claims 2-7, the Examiner acknowledges that *Martin* fails to teach “a plurality of mobile stations, each of which communicates with said information terminal” (OA, i.e. at pages 3 and 7). The Examiner asserts the same case for obviousness with respect to this element absent in *Martin* for each of claims 1-7. Specifically, the Examiner alleges, “. . . in a mobile station and terminal unit environment, multiple stations are connected to a terminal and are interchangeable” (OA, i.e. at page 7). Accordingly, the patentability arguments presented above for claim 1 are hereby asserted in traversal of the rejection of claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Martin* in view of *Fujii*. At least for failing to disclose the element of “. . . a plurality of mobile stations capable of participating simultaneously in communication with said information terminal unit . . .”, the rejection of claims 2-7 over *Martin* in view of *Fujii* under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 10/058,805

ART UNIT 2144  
Q68279

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Amelia F. Morani, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 52,049

**SUGHRUE MION, PLLC**  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 31, 2005